

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 7, 17-19, 23-26 and 30 are considered in the Office Action.

Claims 1-2, 17-18 and 24-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bloomquist U.S. Patent 6,295,133 (“Bloomquist”).

Claims 3, 19 and 26 have been rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bloomquist in view of Gass U.S. Patent No. 5,822,503 (“Gass”).

Claims 7, 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bloomquist in view of Hains U.S. Patent No. 6,262,811 (“Hains”).

Reply to § 103(a) Rejections

The Office action has rejected independent claims 1, 17 and 24 as obvious over Bloomquist. The Office action, however, fails to make out a prima facie case of obviousness. First, the Office action at page 3 states that Bloomquist FIG. 11, item 236, and Col. 13, lines 56-65 describes providing a database including a spot color name associated with corresponding image data. The cited portions, however, do not describe or suggest anything of the sort. Instead, the cited portions merely describe a process step 236 in which second raster data 176 (a modification image) are created for modifying first raster data 170 (an original image). (Col. 13, lines 48-50). The modification image contains a modification to the original image, and also contains a mask layer, which may be a spot color layer created with page composition software. (Col. 13, lines 56-60). The mask layer is given the specific name “mask” for identification by print driver 41. (Col. 13, lines 63-65).

Nothing in this cited portion describes or suggests anything about a database that includes a spot color name associated with corresponding image data. Bloomquist nowhere describes or suggests that second raster data 176 somehow constitutes a “database” as that term is used in this application and would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Further, Bloomquist nowhere describes or suggests that second raster data 176 includes a spot color name. Indeed, Bloomquist does not say anything about spot color names, and the Office action has not identified any such teaching. Bloomquist states that the mask layer has a name “mask,” but Bloomquist

does not suggest or even hint that “mask” is somehow a spot color name as that term is used in this application and would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Second, the Office action at page 3 states that Bloomquist Col. 13, lines 56-65 describes receiving a print job including PDL code that includes a reference to the spot color name. Once again, the cited portion, however, does not describe or suggest anything of the sort. In particular, the cited portion does not describe or suggest anything about receiving a print job that includes PDL code, and more specifically does not describe or suggest anything about PDL code that includes a reference to a spot color name. In this regard, the Office action seems to gloss over the actual claim language, and instead identifies a portion of Bloomquist that merely refers to the phrase “spot color layer.” The Office action does not provide any convincing argument why anyone would somehow interpret the cited portion as having anything to do with receiving a print job including PDL code that includes a reference to a spot color name.

Third, the Office action at page 3 states that Bloomquist Col. 13, line 65 through Col. 14, line 3 describes identifying a spot color name in the PDL code. Once again, the cited portion, however, does not describe or suggest anything of the sort. Instead, the cited portion merely states that “[o]ther techniques of identifying the mask layer can also be used, but the identification needs to fit within the workflow constraints of the prepress environment” Thus, other than including the words “identifying” and “identification,” the cited portion does not describe or suggest anything about identifying a spot color name in PDL code. Once again, the Office action seems to ignore the actual claim language, and instead tries to support the obviousness rejection based on random portions of Bloomquist that happen to include some words in common with some words in the claims.

Fourth, the Office action at page 3 states that Bloomquist Col. 14, lines 4-10 describes retrieving from a database corresponding image data associated with an identified spot color name. Once again, the cited portion, however, does not describe or suggest anything of the sort. Instead, the cited portion of Bloomquist describes how second raster data 176 is imposed on a page relative to the placement of first raster data 170. Nothing in this cited portion, however describes or suggests anything about retrieving anything from a database. Indeed, Bloomquist does not describe anything about retrieving second raster data 176 from a database, and the Office action does not

identify any such teaching. Further if Bloomquist describes such a database, the Office action does not identify any teaching of the database including a spot color name associated with corresponding image data.


Fifth, the Office action at page 3 states that Bloomquist Col. 13, lines 56-63, Col. 7, lines 51-59 and Col. 14, lines 4-10) describe adding PDL code to a print job for painting a retrieved image data as a PostScript pattern in the print job. Of all of the assertions in the Office action, this is perhaps the most egregious, as the cited portion does not describe or suggest anything about adding PDL code to a print job, let alone adding PDL code for painting an image as a PostScript pattern. In this regard, the Office action once again ignores the actual claim language, which recites PostScript patterns, which are specific types of PostScript commands. In so doing, the Office action seemingly translates PostScript patterns to generic “PDL patterns,” and then seemingly translates “PDL patterns” to generic PDL code. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office action fails to justify any such dilution of the claim language.

Similarly, the Office action fails to identify any teaching in Bloomquist of painting a retrieved image data as a PostScript pattern in the print job, but instead effectively eliminates the phrase “PostScript pattern” from the claim language by equating it with generic PDL code. Because the Office action has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejections and allow this case.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicant submits that this application, including claims 1-3, 7, 17-19, 23-26 and 30, is allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,



James Trosino
Registration No. 39,862
Attorney for Applicant